1	bankruptcy with a different view of your
2	characterization.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Well,
4	we can get into that. Maybe you have some
5	very interesting views on this. But let me
6	hear Mr. Keller
7	MR. KELLER: That's just
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Go ahead.
9	MR. KELLER: That's just my
10	representation to you generally of what the
11	plan provides for.
12	The hearing has been set on this.
13	I believe the hearing in bankruptcy court is
14	scheduled for June the 13th of this year,
15	right? Sometimes those change, but I believe
16	that's the date set for the hearing.
17	When we had our last discussion of
18	this in here, the thought was that the second
19	Thursday proposal would be filed upon
20	confirmation of the plan, which is a fancy
21	word for approving the plan.

We certainly will not be filing

any later than that, I mean, shortly after confirmation. But I have had discussions with FCC counsel for Choctaw. And there is some idea that we might file earlier than that. Basically what we would key it to is we are waiting to find out about any sort of what bait in the stalking horse they call bankruptcy court; whereas, is the court going to open this up to competing bids? And if so, is there going to be a deadline for such competing bids?

And at such time as we are satisfied that either there are not going to be competing bids or the deadline has passed and none of them filed; in other words, as long as we are reasonably sure that this is not merely a stalking horse but is the entity that is ultimately going to be approved by the bankruptcy court, we would probably want to proceed and go ahead and make the second Thursday filing at that time.

Obviously the Commission would not

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

rule on it until the final bankruptcy court 1 confirmation, but, nevertheless, we can get 2 the paperwork in. So that is sort of the game 3 4 plan at this point. JUDGE SIPPEL: What kind of date? 5 In broad estimates, what kind of dates? 6 You've got June 13th for a hearing. 7 MR. KELLER: Honestly I don't know 8 for sure. My guess is early -- if we wait 9 until confirmation, we're probably talking 10 about sometime in the -- maybe very late 11 Sometime in 12 summer or very early on. August-September possibly. I don't know. 13 But if the court on June 13th 14 either does not open this up for bids or sets 15 a deadline that's earlier than that, then we 16 could possibly file the second Thursday plan 17 earlier than that, you know. 18 But, nonetheless, the Commission 19 is not going to act on the second Thursday 20 plan until the confirmation anyway. 21

suspect confirmation is going to come

August-September. 1 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you're right 2 about the second point, but let's just take 3 things at they are. Now, you said that there 4 was a plan of reorganization filed on the 30th 5 of April. Do the parties have a copy of that? 6 7 The parties --MR. KELLER: I believe so. I know 8 9 this --We do, Your Honor. 10 MS. KANE: have reviewed it. And we have serious 11 concerns with it in terms of the impact it 12 13 might have on a second Thursday filing. As was explained by Mr. Keller, 14 this plan contemplates assigning the entire 15 portfolio of Maritime's licenses, which are 16 17 still currently valued at \$42.2 million, to a group of secured creditors that are only owed 18 19 \$17 million. this discussion had We have 20 in prehearing conferences 21 times before, but there is a concern that there is 22

1	no precedent for applying second Thursday when
2	you are assigning greater value to the
3	creditors than what they are owed.
4	MR. HAVENS: The
5	MS. KANE: I'm sorry. Excuse me,
6	Mr. Havens.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Havens?
8	MR. HAVENS: Yes, sir.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: I've got a button
10	here. I can stop this right now, but I don't
11	want to. Just hang on. Just hang on.
12	Go ahead. Finish, please.
13	MS. KANE: The Bureau is quite
14	concerned that a second Thursday filing based
15	on this plan would not be sufficient. And we
16	have been holding up every other issue in this
17	hearing based on the fact that second Thursday
18	would resolve those issues. But with this
19	kind of plan, we have serious concerns.
20	We know that at previous points,
21	we have talked about a valuation process
ı	

heard nothing that there's been any additional 1 valuation of these licenses. And, in fact, in 2 their plan, Maritime has continued to stand by 3 their \$42.2 million assessment that Mr. Keller 4 has said is inaccurate. 5 So we're befuddled because 6 thought there was going to be a valuation 7 8 processing occurring in the bankruptcy court or that a valuation process should occur in 9 this arena in order to determine whether a 10 11 second Thursday filing is even possible. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, let me ask 12 Mr. Keller that question, then. What about 13 valuation? Is the bankruptcy court involved 14 15 in that? MR. KELLER: Your Honor, I don't 16 believe -- well, first of all, I take issue 17 with the issues, as it were. The rubrics of 18 alleged 19 Thursday are that the second wrongdoers not benefit and that there is 20 21 benefit to the innocent creditors.

what

the

Whether

22

innocent

creditors receive is a portion of what they have coming to them, all of what they have coming to them, or in this case possibly more than what they have coming to them under the plan does not negate second Thursday. The only issue for second Thursday where an overvalue, if you want to call it that, would be of concern would be to make sure that none of that overvalue gets back to the alleged wrongdoers.

In this particular case, I cannot speak to what the internal bankruptcy law reasons are. I can check with bankruptcy counsel and find out why this particular valuation was used. I suspect because it was the one that was already on file with the court.

But, be that as it may, what I can tell you is that the secured creditors who make up Choctaw are sort of taking a risk here. They're saying, "All right. We're going to forego our claims" of however many

2.0

million dollars it is -- I don't know the exact number -- "in exchange for which we will take these assets."

They're also -- it's not just their claims. They're also making good on all of the other claims, all the administrative claims, all the other secured claims, all the unsecured claims. They're undertaking to pull that off.

They're gambling, if you want to call it that. But yes. They certainly do hope that the total value of the portfolio will be more than that, which is why they are willing to take that risk. They have no guarantee of that.

But for second Thursday purposes, it really is irrelevant. It is irrelevant whether the actual value turns out to be half of what the claims, equal to what the claims are, or twice what the claims are worth so long as the innocent creditors do not benefit; and, second, the alleged wrongdoers do not

benefit.

And, furth
an issue to be addresse

And, furthermore, this is really an issue to be addressed in the context of the second Thursday proposal. Whether this is or is not proper for second Thursday, those are the merits of second Thursday itself.

MR. HAVENS: Can I address this appropriately, sir?

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I just want to just ask. Let me say my piece. And yes, you will.

It sounds to me like you're asking the Commission to be part of a kind of a gaming procedure here that Choctaw is going to roll the dice on this. If they come up high, that's great.

Now, I don't know what the bottom is. I don't know how they're securing their bottom on this. But it doesn't sound like it's -- to me it sounds like it's got elements of at least some things happening that I would like to know more about.

1	MR. KELLER: I'm aware of actually
2	no precedent that says that second Thursday
3	prohibits selling the assets for more than
4	they are worth so long as the alleged
5	wrongdoers are not
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: It's going to be a
7	case of first impressions. How do they know
8	that they are going to be able to get
9	licenses, I mean, that the Commission is going
10	to approve the licenses?
11	MR. KELLER: Well, that's the
12	whole point of the second Thursday proposal,
13	is to
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: They don't
15	automatically get them.
16	MR. KELLER: I understand that.
17	MR. HAVENS: Can I address this,
18	sir?
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, sir. Yes,
20	sir, Mr. Havens. You have been very patient.
20 21	sir, Mr. Havens. You have been very patient. MR. HAVENS: Thank you.

called on the specific matter that Maritime raised with regard to the issue G. Your Honor issued an order that the parties meet a concern, attempt to agree upon what would be the limitation of this for the hearing. That was agreed to. The agreement was it was issue G.

Mr. Keller is blindsiding my companies and myself by getting into other issues in this hearing, including a subsequent argument on second Thursday, when I didn't have any opportunity to prepare with counsel or invite our bankruptcy counsel to be a part of this debate.

so I object to Mr. Keller making an agreement under Your Honor's order on what the limitation would be in this hearing and then flagrantly getting into an argument from second Thursday and discussing the bankruptcy plan, which I believe is improperly characterized, including even what it is.

So I don't know how to -- I mean,

I am being told I am the non-attorney, I am the party who can be out of order. I think Mr. Keller is out of order here. And it is inappropriate in any hearing to agree on one thing, to limitation, to call for a meeting with certain specific issues to be raised, and then to get into an entirely different matter.

I don't know how to participate with or without attorneys when the hearing is called for one thing and then a party is allowed to give substantive arguments.

And I respect Ms. Kane for her views on that. And I think I agree with what she expressed, but this was not a topic today. How could I prepare for it with counsel and bankruptcy counsel if it wasn't to be an issue today?

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I think if you had a lawyer here, you wouldn't have that problem. I mean, this is just a hearing conference. I mean, yes, I want to know what everybody is prepared to talk about, but I am

not disappointed when somebody says -- you 1 know, this bankruptcy issue has been hanging 2 around for a long time. We're just simply 3 getting a status report. Okay. 4 If I --MR. HAVENS: 5 JUDGE SIPPEL: Look, he can make 6 all the arguments he wants. You can make all 7 the arguments you want. You are just in a 8 prehearing conference. There is nothing going 9 10 to be resolved on arguments. I just get the --MR. HAVENS: 11 JUDGE SIPPEL: There's 12 no evidence. 13 MR. HAVENS: This wasn't an issue 14 to be discussed today. And it's not just a 15 status report that Mr. Keller is giving. 16 was making substantive arguments on how the 17 plan he discussed, the chapter 11 plan, should 18 meet the standard as he sees the standard 19 20 being or the new precedent being for second Thursday. 21

So unless I knew that would be

1	argued, how can I prepare for that?
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Look, Mr
3	MS. KANE: Your Honor, maybe I can
4	help.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Go ahead, Ms. Kane.
6	Please help me.
7	MS. KANE: Let me try. Maritime
8	filed a report regarding what would be sort of
9	attempts to reach agreement on what would be
10	covered in this prehearing conference in which
11	the parties did agree that at least the issue
12	of issue G and discovery related to issue G
13	would be covered.
14	He did raise the fact in that
15	pleading, which he served on Mr. Havens and I
16	presume on Mr. Havens' other entities'
17	counsel, that he would raise a bankruptcy
18	status issue. So, at least from that
19	perspective, I am actually defending Maritime
20	in here that he has provided notice that this
21	would be a topic for discussion today.

JUDGE SIPPEL: You don't have to

use that terminology. 1 MR. HAVENS: I understand. Ι 2 understand the --3 JUDGE SIPPEL: No, Mr. 4 no. wait a minute. Ι 5 Havens, you -now, interrupted. Ms. Kane is not finished. Just 6 hold off. 7 MS. KANE: The other issue that we 8 9 want to at least -- and we don't want to get into a substantive discussion today of second 10 Thursday, but we are concerned that this HDO 11 12 was released over a year ago. It covers issues that pertain to the qualifications of 13 Maritime and whether it should be entitled to 14 remain a licensee. 15 And the only basis on which those 16 licenses could be transferred in the absence 17 of an adjudication by Your Honor on those 18 issues is an exception to that. And that is 19 second Thursday. And so the large spectrum of 20 such a second Thursday that Maritime 21

suggesting flies in the face of the fact that

it is an exception to Jefferson Radio and should be narrowly construed.

And we have been holding up all of these other issues on the qualifications of Maritime to hold these licenses and to transfer the licenses in the hopes that second Thursday would resolve those issues.

Our concern is that this plan is not going to be certainly the way it is phrased immediately granted and that we will continue to hold those issues in abeyance ad infinitum until Maritime can provide a plan that actually complies with the narrow construction of second Thursday as an exception to Jefferson Radio.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you want to respond to that?

MR. KELLER: I only want to say a couple of things. One is, Ms. Kane, thank you. She already said the one thing I was going to say, that in our filing that we made on the report of our negotiations, paragraph

1	6, we did specifically state that we would be
2	providing a report on the status and
3	developments in the bankruptcy.
4	The only reason I got into
5	anything that might be characterized as
6	substance or merits at all was because the
7	Bureau raised the issue, saying they had
8	problems with the plan and what they were.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Now,
10	are you satisfied with that, Mr. Havens? He
11	did give notice.
12	MR. HAVENS: No, I'm not, because
13	it was Maritime who called this prehearing
14	because the Bureau has made many filings with
15	regard to Maritime not complying with the
16	obligations of discovery on issue G.
17	But, Your Honor, I would prefer
18	this prehearing to get to issue G. I don't
19	have anything further to say about that
20	because I don't want to spend time on that
21	issue right now.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, okay. Let's

1	leave it, then. We're not going to hear about
2	it again.
3	I'm sorry. I cut you off, Mr
4	MR. KELLER: No. That's really
5	all I have to say. I mean, I figure, as with
6	other things, I'm sure more will be said in
7	writing about this in the near future.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: There is no
9	question about that. Now
10	MS. KANE: Your Honor, if we may,
11	where do we stand on whether there will be
12	additional valuation of these licenses?
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Right now? We're
14	stuck. You know, if you have a theory on
15	this, I don't know what the obligations are
16	for anybody to make a valuation at this point,
17	but I do have some serious questions as to
18	whether the second Thursday can be used in the
19	way that it is being used. I think there is
20	a process problem here, issues of it anyway.
21	I mean, that's where my concern
22	is. I'm trying to avoid getting down into the

depths of what the bankruptcy court is supposed to be doing. And if they're not interested in valuation, I would like to know why. Nobody is raising it.

MR. KELLER: I'm not a bankruptcy lawyer, but I believe the bankruptcy court's

lawyer, but I believe the bankruptcy court's concern about valuation would just be to make sure that once it's -- I think the bankruptcy court's concern diminishes greatly once they're satisfied that the creditors are satisfied. And this was a plan that was negotiated with all of the secured creditors and the unsecured creditors' committee.

And I will have to speak with bankruptcy counsel. I suspect -- I don't know what the reasons were for using this particular valuation plan. I think it was just to demonstrate that there is at least some reasonable basis for believing that the assets were not to cover the claims.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I would think, though, that in a normal bankruptcy

proceeding, about four years ago, I was in one 1 to help a nurse who was bankrupt, but, you 2 know, you list all the assets up. It gets a 3 value. And that's what the bankruptcy -- you 4 know, there wasn't even a hearing, but that is 5 what is acted upon. And there is verification 6 under oath or something that this is what the 7 value is, estimated values or market value, 8 whatever you want to call it. 9 There is speculative value. This 10 thing might be worth \$50 million or it might 11 be worth \$17 million and you're going to roll 12 13 the dice. You know, you might be rich or you might not be rich. But I don't know what the 14 15 hell is going on. 16 MR. KELLER: That's a bankruptcy law issue, Your Honor. And I think if the 17 18 Bureau --Right 19 JUDGE SIPPEL: now making it my issue until I get clarification. 20 MR. KELLER: Well, again, I'm 21 22 saying that I dispute it. Maybe we're going

1	to have to brief this issue, too, but I
2	dispute that the valuation is really that much
3	of an issue under second Thursday.
4	The issue under second Thursday is
5	not how much the licenses are worth. The
6	issue is whether or not
7	MR. HAVENS: Well, here we go.
8	We're back into the argument.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Now, wait a minute,
10	Mr. Havens. We're not back into the argument.
11	We're not in there. Forget about it.
12	MR. KELLER: We're just trying to
13	find
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: This is where you
15	need a lawyer because you are concerned about
16	things that really aren't concerns. This is
17	a prehearing conference. It is not a hearing.
18	There is no testimony being taken. We don't
19	have an evidentiary record even yet, which is
20	what we are trying to put together.
21	MR. HAVENS: All right.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Just hold your

horses. Okay? I've got to get back to this 1 Hold on just a second. 2 point. MR. HAVENS: I have that for you 3 4 if you would like it. JUDGE SIPPEL: No, not right now. 5 Mr. Keller, I have been Look, 6 distracted in so many ways. Valuation -- I'm 7 You said second Thursday only 8 Yes. wants to know one or two things. I've been 9 through second Thursday proceedings before. 10 They have been successful. And they have 11 always been a little bit problematical but not 12 13 to these proportions. Nobody really knows the what 14 ultimate limits of second Thursday are. 15 every case is a new case. Every situation is 16 a new situation. 17 I don't know if second Thursday is 18 intended to do what you say you are planning 19 That valuation doesn't mean a hoot. 20 to do. I don't see how valuation doesn't mean a hoot. 21 22 Just because the creditors are happy with it?

MR. KELLER: There is nothing in 1 rubrics of second Thursday and the 2 the precedents of second Thursday that says that 3 it's limited to situations in which the 4 stations are undervalued. 5 JUDGE SIPPEL: No, I didn't say 6 7 "undervalued." I didn't say --Or overvalued, for MR. KELLER: 8 that matter. I mean, but the Bureau seems to 9 10 be saying that unless they're worth less than the claims are worth, that somehow there is a 11 problem, that if there is going to be any 12 profit at all, that somehow second Thursday no 13 longer applies. I defy anyone to point to a 14 single second Thursday case that says any such 15 16 thing. Well, there 17 JUDGE SIPPEL: certainly an element of integrity and honesty 18 in any judicial proceeding. I don't think the 19 20 Commission wants to be having some kind of a slippery deal pulled off on them and send a 21

second Thursday on that basis.

1	MR. KELLER: That's the big deal?
2	We
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I don't know
4	if it's a big deal. I'm just trying to
5	exaggerate obviously to make the point. I
6	mean, you've got to know what's the point
7	is you've got to know what's going on. You
8	know what I'm saying.
9	MR. KELLER: We know what's going
10	on. The parties are willing to make this
11	deal. And those wrongdoers are not going to
12	benefit from it. We don't know for sure.
13	What the licenses are worth is
14	what they can later be sold for. And, as I
L5	have often said in this proceeding, I'll
16	guarantee you that if there is a second
17	Thursday grant in this case, a second Thursday
18	approval, then yes, then the licenses are
19	going to be worth a heck of a lot more than
20	they are now.
21	MR. HAVENS: Mr
22	MR. KELLER: Now they're worth

1	nothing because of this -
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: How do you know
3	that there isn't some deal down the road? I
4	mean, this thing sounds very
5	MR. KELLER: The Commission has
6	addressed that in other cases by placing
7	conditions on there can always be a deal
8	down the road, but the Commission places
9	conditions on
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Are the Depriests
11	going to be in any line of communication
12	business after this is all over?
13	MR. KELLER: I don't know what
14	they're going to be, but they are certainly
15	going to have absolutely no involvement in
16	these licenses. And there will conditions on
17	the grant to
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: There will be, but
19	
20	MR. HAVENS: Judge Sippel?
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: I don't think you
22	understand what I'm talking about.